

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-6679

OPHEILA AZRIEL DE'LONTA, a/k/a Michael A.
Stokes,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE; M. V. SMITH, Doctor; R.
HULBERT, Doctor; C. J. ANGLIKER, Doctor; DOC-
TOR WRAY; DOCTOR SWETTER,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 00-6680

OPHEILA AZRIEL DE'LONTA, a/k/a Michael A.
Stokes,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE; M. V. SMITH, Doctor; R.
HULBERT, Doctor; C. J. ANGLIKER, Doctor; DOC-
TOR WRAY; DOCTOR SWETTER,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, District Judge. (CA-99-642-7)

Submitted: August 15, 2000

Decided: September 15, 2000

Before WILKINS, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

No. 00-6679 dismissed and No. 00-6680 affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Opheila Azriel De'Lonta, Appellant Pro Se. William W. Muse, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia; George W. Wooten, Peter Duane Vieth, WOOTEN & HART, P.C., Roanoke, Virginia; Heather Marie Kofron, WRIGHT, ROBINSON, OSTMER & TATUM, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Opheila Azriel De'Lonta appeals the denial of her motions for appointment of counsel and preliminary injunctive relief. In appeal No. 00-6679, De'Lonta challenges the magistrate judge's order denying her motion for appointment of counsel. We dismiss for lack of jurisdiction because the order is not appealable. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, see 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1994), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, see 28 U.S.C.A. § 1292 (1994); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order here appealed is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. See Miller v. Simmons, 814 F.2d 962, 964 (4th Cir. 1987).

In appeal No. 00-6680, De'Lonta challenges the district court's order denying her amended motion for preliminary injunctive relief. We find that the court did not abuse its discretion. See Direx Israel, Ltd. v. Breakthrough Medical Corp., 952 F.2d 802, 814-15 (4th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See De'Lonta v. Angelone, No. CA-99-642-7 (W.D. Va. May 9, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

No. 00-6679 - DISMISSED
No. 00-6680 - AFFIRMED